DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 816 HE 024 664

AUTHOR Serafin, Ana Gil
TITLE Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire: Development, Validity, and Reliability.
PUB DATE 19 Mar 91
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Research Convocation of the College of Education of Western Michigan University (Kalamazoo, MI, March 19, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Instruction; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty College Relationship; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Measurement Techniques; Noninstructional Responsibility; *Occupational Surveys; *Reliability; Research; Services; Teacher Attitudes; Validity
IDENTIFIERS Universidad Pedagogica Libertador (Venezuela); Venezuela

ABSTRACT

This study sought to design and test a survey instrument which examined college faculty satisfaction with their roles of teaching, research, and service. A panel of experts reviewed the Spanish and English versions of the 39 item survey for quality of items and grammatical accuracy. Thirty randomly selected faculty members from a population of 234 faculty at the Universidad Pedagogica Experimental Libertador (UPEL) of Venezuela participated in the field testing with 22 responding, or 73.3 percent. Results indicated a high level of validity and reliability for all three categories, teaching (r=.85), research (r=.80) and service (r=.85). Further research established the reliability of the measures by testing 207 more faculty from UPEL with similar results (teaching: r=.76; research: r=.68; and service: r=.83). A copy of the instrument evaluation form and English and Spanish versions of the survey form are appended. (17 references) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333816

FACULTY SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE: DEVELOPMENT, VALIDITY, AND RELIABILITY

by

Dr. Ana Gil Serafin

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to design and test a survey instrument in which college faculty satisfaction with their role functions of teaching, research, and service were examined. Randomly selected faculty members from the Universidad Pedagogica Experimental Libertador (UPEL) of Venezuela, composed by seven branches, were the population (N=234). Items of Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire (FSQ), English and Spanish versions, gathered from the literature were subjected to panel of experts review and field testing.

Thirty faculty members participated in the field testing. The evidence of the validity and reliability of the measures showed that the alpha of teaching (11 items) r=.85; research (9 items) r=.80; and service (9 items) r=.85. More evidence of sufficient reliability of the measures was established testing 207 faculty members of UPEL. No negative item-correlations among the items were found. The three measures were identified as reliable for each section of the instrument. The alpha of teaching was .76, research .86, and service .83. The retention of respectable alpha coefficient, larger than .50, is further documentation of the reliability of the 39 items instrument formatted into four pages.

The universal mission of the university are those of teaching, research, and service. Faculty are the human factors in charge of carrying out such academic functions. Faculty are aware of the concerns regarding curriculum, discrepancies between theory and

HE 024 664

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ana Gil Serafin

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

practice, student needs, multicultural diversity, budget restrictions, and so on. The faculty as a key defender of the tradition of the university has been studied widely. Faculty and their satisfactions are the main targets of this study.

Studies in faculty satisfaction mention that teaching itself is a source of satisfaction (Cooper, 1973; DeFrain, 1979; Ibrahim, 1985/1986; McNair, 1973/1980; Mellinger, 1982; Miller, 1986; Riday, 1981; "Teachers Are Proud," 1980; Weissman, 1981/1982). Also, teaching as a profession is another element that may produce satisfaction (Diener, 1985; Eckert & Stecklein, 1961; Nussel, Wiersma, & Rusche, 1988). Data on faculty activities, concerns, and commitments have shown that as a group faculty spend much more time on teaching (Ladd, 1979). Investigations in faculty satisfaction also mention research as part of their satisfactions (Woodrow, 1978). Research is more highly valued than teaching (Blackburn et al., 1980; Parelius, 1982). Concerning service, it can be considered "the broken leg of the stool." Service, as described by Martin (1977), "is short, poorly conceptualized and erratically expressed."

OBJECTIVES OF INQUIRY

The objective of this study was to design and test a survey instrument in which college faculty satisfaction with their role functions of teaching, research, and service were examined.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

Format Criteria

The level of faculty satisfaction was measured by the Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire (FSQ) using a Likert-type scale (1= very dissatisfied, 2= dissatisfied, 3= neutral, 4= satisfied, and 5= very satisfied). Scoring weights for these choices were: 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. A series of steps were followed to design the instrument and to ensure consistent and accurate results. The first step was an examination of the literature regarding satisfaction with teaching, research, and service in higher education institutions. This stage resulted in a large list of items, in modified form, serving as pool from which the final set of items was drawn. The items were grouped into three dimensions: teaching statements, research statements, and service statements. The satisfaction score for each dimension was determined by summing the weights for all items related to the variable.

Overview of the Instrument Development

The FSQ had 51 items in its first version. Forty-two items were related to teaching, research, and service statements and 9 items requested information on personal and professional background. The questionnaire was divided into three sections:

teaching, research, and service. each section had 14 items describing some general aspects of the faculty position functions. The items intended to apply to only university faculty's job.

A page containing demographic items was also constructed requesting: (a) gender, (b) age, (c) earned degrees, (d) years of experience in higher education, (e) academic rank, (f) previous teaching experiences in other educational levels, and (g) rewards obtained due to teaching, research, and/or service activities.

Expert Review

An examination of all specifications of role function was reviewed by a panel of experts who submitted their judgments based on a table of specifications containing the elements of faculty satisfaction found in the literature. It provided the content and structure of each item in the FSQ. A summary of the table of specifications is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Table of Specifications

Aspect	Elements of Satisfaction	Item
Teaching	1. Teaching itself	1
	2. Teaching workload	11
	3. Class size	12
	4. Curriculum preparation	2,3,4,8,9,10
	5. Academic freedom	5
	6. Teaching as a profession	7
	7. Facilities and equipment	13
	8. Advising	6
	9. Teaching rewards	14
Research	1. Financial support	1,11
	2. Time release	2
	3. Publications	3,9
	4. Assistance	7,8,9
	5. Institutional research	4,13
	6. Intellectual research	5
	7. Research rewards	6,12
	8. Sabbatical leaves	14
Service	1. Personal growth	3,5,10
	2. Professional growth	1,2,4,6
	3. Financial support	12,13
	4. Administrative duties	7,11
	5. Consulting	8,9
	6. Service rewards	14

The panel's task was to compare the elements of teaching, research, and service to the items as operationalized aspects of the literature review. The panel reviewed the items for comprehension, content, and length. The content validity of the English version was then assessed by three experts. The Spanish version of the

instrument was reviewed by Spanish grammar expert in order to verify the sentence structure, wording, and the accuracy in the translation of the instrument. An instrument evaluation form (Appendix A) was constructed to summarize and concentrate the results (opinion, judgment, changes, etc) given by each panel member. It helped to insure that comments were gathered on each item regarding the themes involved. The first draft of FSQ was first reviewed in its English version. It was expected that two out of three panel members made similar suggestions prior to translating it into Spanish language.

Results of Expert Review

An item was rated based on the following criteria: (a) essential; (b) important, but not essential; and (c) not important. The items placed as essential by two out of three experts were automatically chosen. The results of the teaching statements, Part I, were as follows: 11 items were selected, and Item 3 regarding "the nature of the material to be taught," Item 4 about "deciding the content of the course," and Item 10 referring to "flexibility of the program to meet the needs of individual undergraduate majors" were dropped because of unclear wording.

Regarding Part II, research statements, 9 items remained and 5 (Items 4, 5, 9, 11, and 12) were eliminated. Item 4 related to "research opportunities to support institutional planning and

decision making" and Item 5 asking about "research opportunities for the intellectual growth of the faculty and students" were dropped due to their broad and ambiguous content. In respect to "writing research proposal" (Item 9), was found to be included into the Item 1 text, in addition, it was rated as not important. Item 12 was dropped due to its similarity with Item 6.

In Part III, service statements, nine items were kept without being modified, and Items 12 and 13 regarding financial support for attending conferences, seminars, making presentations, and so forth, were merged. The experts concurred in eliminating Item 3 referring to "institutional planning to provide personal enrichment," Item 4 about "improving consulting skills," Item 5 regarding "enhancing interpersonal skills," and Item 6 on "exploring career options." There was complete accord in the reasons given such as content ambiguity (Item 3) and complexity (Item 5). Items 4 and 6 were considered as lacking of importance. Structure modification of Item 10 was suggested.

In regard to the Personal and Professional Data instrument attached, the panel agreed with eliminating Item 8, regarding the assessment of level of effort on specific tasks, due to its complexity and length. In reviewing the directions of FSQ, it was suggested that the items indicated more than activities. Therefore, the initial instructing paragraph was changed including activities, actions, conditions and/or functions of teaching, research, and service.

Field Testing

The field testing would test the reliability of the instrument and the methods and procedures. Thirty faculty members participated in the field testing. The criteria for selecting these faculty were: (a) being a full-time faculty in the selected institutions, (b) teaching a specific subject area, and (c) assigned to determined academic department. The items retained were rearranged for the field instrument. The 29 items of teaching, research, and service aspects, and the 8 items of demographic information were formatted into six pages. Respondents were ensured confidentiality. Being anonymous was underlined as relevant in the directions. Reliability for each variable was determined by use of the Cronbach alpha coefficient.

RESULTS

At the 3-week point, 17 of the 30 participants had responded, for an 56.6% return rate. Four weeks following the field testing there remained 13 nonrespondents. The data collection was suspended at the fifth week. The final response rate was 22 of the 30 mailed, or 73.3%. The evidence of the validity and reliability of the measures showed that the alpha of teaching (11 items) r= .85; research (9 items) r= .80; and service (9 items) r= .85. No negative item-correlations among the items were found. Consequently, no

changes in the instrument or procedure were made on the basis of the field test.

Later, more evidence of sufficient reliability of the measures was established testing 207 faculty members of UPEL. The three measures were ratified as reliable for each section of the instrument. The alpha of teaching was .76, research .86, and service .83. As it is observed, the alpha coefficient for teaching decreased; however, the retention of respectable alpha coefficient, larger than .50, is further documentation of the reliability of the 39 items instrument formatted into four pages. Table 2 reports the field testing findings.

Table 2

Field Testing Report

	Measures		
	Teaching	Research	Service
Field I (N=30)	r= .85	r= .80	r= .85
Field II (N=207)	r= .76	r= .86	r= .83

EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of the study lies in its potential to determine individuals' satisfaction with their position functions in terms of

teaching, research, and service aspects. Given the factors of professional status and recurring criticism involving faculty, student, and university performance, FSQ may help to identify elements in the level of faculty satisfaction with their position functions that would provide responses to questions from the public domain.

The individual analysis of a particular items contained in the instrument may be the primary step to find out what specific aspect of either teaching, research, or service produces more or less feelings of satisfaction on faculty. In analyzing satisfaction with teaching aspects, that is, teaching techniques, course design, evaluative strategies, grading, and classroom practices, results may help to make curricular decisions across campuses. The same is true for research and service statements. This type of instrument could fortify the study findings in terms of identifying what precise aspect is really fostering more individual satisfaction.

References

Blackburn, R. T., Boberg, A., O'Connell, C., & Pellino, G. (1980). Project for faculty development program evaluation. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 767)

Cooper, H. (1977). Service-learning through internships and research for state government. In W. B. Martin (Ed.), Redefining service, research, and teaching. New Directions for Higher Education, 18, Vol. 5 (2), pp. 37-52. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

DeFrain, J. (1979). College teachers' work motivation, central life interests, and voluntarism as predictors of job satisfaction and job performance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4322A.

Diener, T. (1985). Job satisfaction and college faculty in two predominant Black institutions. Journal of Negro Education, 54(4), 558-565.

Eckert, R., & Stecklein, J. (1961). Job motivations and satisfactions of college teachers: A study of faculty members in Minnesota colleges. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Program.

Ibrahim, J. M. (1986). Job satisfaction of faculty members at selected southern universities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 4737A.

Ladd, E. (1979). Work experience of American college professors. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 406)

Martin, W. B. (1977). Service through ideas of value. In W. B. Martin (ED.), Redefining service, research, and teaching. New Directions for Higher Education, 18, Vol. 5 (2), pp. 1-16. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McNair, B. (1980). The relationships between selected faculty characteristics and teaching effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstract International, 41, 4916A.

Mellinger, G. (1982). An investigation of academic job satisfaction/dissatisfaction in a small struggling liberal arts college (Doctoral dissertation, university of Pittsburgh, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 941A.

Miller, G. (1986). Organizational climate and job satisfaction of independent college faculty (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1986). Dissertation Abstract International, 47, 2047A.

Nussel, E., Wiersma, W., & Rusche, P. (1988). Work satisfaction of education professors. The Journal of Teacher Education, 39(3), 45-50.

Parelius, R. J. (1982). The troubles with teaching undergraduates: Problems arising from organizational, professional, collegial, and client relations. Washington, DC: national Institution of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210 985)

Riday, G. (1981). Job satisfaction: a comparative study of community college faculty to secondary school and four-year college faculty (Doctoral dissertation, Bringham Young University, 1981). Dissertation Abstract International, 42, 4371A.

Teachers are proud of their jobs, poll shows. (1980). Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 379.

Weissman, J. W. (1982). The effect of faculty gender on job satisfaction in selected sex-typed units within institutions of higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1981). Dissertation Abstract International, 43, 1856A.

Woodrow, R. (1978). Management for research in U.S. universities. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 185 920)

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT EVALUATION FORM

INSTRUMENT EVALUATION FORM

Please evaluate each item of the instrument. You may also write directly on the instrument.

1. Part I. Teaching Activities.

Importance	Item Number													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Essential														
Important, but not essential														
Not important														

2. Part II. Research Activities.

Importance	Item Number													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Essential														
Important, but not essential														
Not important														

3. Parte III. Service Activities.

Importance	Item Number													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Essential														
Important, but not essential														
Not important														

Please, if you have any suggestion regarding any item or items in particular, feel free to write it.

4. Is there any trait that should be added to any of the three areas?

5. Is there any trait that should be eliminated in any of the three areas?

Personal and Professional Data Questions 1-09

A. Do you consider these items:

_____ essential
_____ important, but not essential
_____ not important

B. If you consider any personal and professional information items not important, please indicate which items are not important and suggest alternatives.

APPENDIX B

FACULTY SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
(English Version)

FACULTY SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine your satisfaction with your role functions relative to teaching, research, and service activities.

There are 37 statements in this booklet. Twenty-nine statements are related to the role functions and the other 8 statements are related to your personal and professional background.

This instrument is strictly confidential and, therefore, you are asked to remain anonymous. Please do not use your name on any returnable materials.

Instructions

1. Read each statement carefully.
2. Indicate how satisfied you are with the role you perform described by the statement.

   * If you feel that your role provides more satisfaction than you expected with respect to a particular item, circle the number under **Very Satisfied** (5).

   * If you feel that your role provides the expected satisfaction with respect to a particular item, circle the number under **Satisfied** (4).

   * If you do not have any opinion regarding satisfaction with the statement, circle the number under **Neutral** (3).

   * If you feel that your role provides less satisfaction than you expected with respect to a particular item, circle the number under **Dissatisfied** (2).

   * If you feel that your role provides you much less satisfaction than you expected with respect to a particular item, circle the number under **Very Dissatisfied** (1)

3. Repeat this process for all statements.
4. Please answer every item.
5. Circle only <u>one</u> response for each statement.

PART I **Teaching Statements**
To what extent are you satisfied with the following statements about teaching activities, actions, conditions, and or functions:

		VS	S	N	D	VD
1.	teaching as a professional career	5	4	3	2	1
2.	teaching in the classroom	5	4	3	2	1
3.	the academic freedom to select and decide the design, content, objectives, and instructional materials of the course you teach	5	4	3	2	1
4.	constructing examinations	5	4	3	2	1
5.	the appropriateness of procedures (papers, grades, exams) used to evaluate students in their courses in the department	5	4	3	2	1
6.	teaching methods (lectures, seminars, audiovisual aids, games) used in the courses of the department	5	4	3	2	1
7.	advising of students	5	4	3	2	1
8.	specialized facilities, such as laboratories, studios, and equipment needed for teaching in your field	5	4	3	2	1
9.	class size	5	4	3	2	1
10.	teaching workload	5	4	3	2	1
11.	institutional teaching rewards	5	4	3	2	1

PART II **Research Statements**
To what extent are you satisfied with the following statements about research activities, actions, conditions, and or functions:

		VS	S	N	D	VD
1.	institutional financial support for research	5	4	3	2	1
2.	the release time offered by the institution for research	5	4	3	2	1
3.	opportunities to publish	5	4	3	2	1

		VS	S	N	D	VD
4.	support for sabatical leaves	5	4	3	2	1
5.	technical assistance in analyzing data	5	4	3	2	1
6.	the computer facilities for processing data	5	4	3	2	1
7.	secretarial and technical assistance	5	4	3	2	1
8.	the department as an academically stimulating place for research	5	4	3	2	1
9.	institutional research rewards	5	4	3	2	1

PART III **Service Statements**
To what extent are you satisfied with the following statements about service activities, actions, conditions, and or functions:

		VS	S	N	D	VD
1.	opportunities outside the university for participating in new developments in your field	5	4	3	2	1
2.	departmental efforts in support of the career development of faculty members	5	4	3	2	1
3.	working on committees	5	4	3	2	1
4.	outside consulting	5	4	3	2	1
5.	working with the school system	5	4	3	2	1
6.	available inservice training opportunities	5	4	3	2	1
7.	attending faculty meetings	5	4	3	2	1
8.	financial and academic support for making presentations, attending conferences, seminars, etc	5	4	3	2	1
9.	institutional service rewards	5	4	3	2	1

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about your personal and professional background by marking with an (X) and or filling in the appropriate space.

1. Sex Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Age
   30 or under ( ) 31 - 40 years ( )
   41 - 50 years ( ) 51 - 60 years ( )
   Over 60 years ( )

3. Academic Rank
   Professor ( ) Associate ( )
   Assistant ( ) Instructor ( )

4. Highest Degree
   Doctorate ( ) Master ( )
   Specialist ( ) Bachelor ( )

5. How many years has it been since you received your highest earned degree? _____ years

6. Years of higher education teaching experience

   a. In this department _____ years
   b. In this institution _____ years
   c. In other higher educ. inst. _____ years
   d. Total _____ years

7. Had you had previous teaching experiences in

   a. primary education Yes ____ No ____
   b. secondary education Yes ____ No ____
   c. other higher educ. institution Yes ____ No ____

8. Have you received an award or otherwise been recognized for

   a. teaching? Yes _____ No _____
   b. research? Yes _____ No _____
   c. service? Yes _____ No _____

APPENDIX C

SATISFACCION DEL DOCENTE UNIVERSITARIO
(Spanish Version)

SATISFACCION DEL DOCENTE UNIVERSITARIO

El siguiente cuestionario contiene 36 frases. Veintinueve se relacionan con aspectos diarios de docencia, investigación y extensión y 8 se refieren a datos personales y profesionales.

El propósito de este instrumento es describir el grado de satisfacción alcanzado por el docente con respecto a las funciones universitarias de docencia, investigación y extensión.

Las páginas siguientes contienen: (1) las instrucciones para completar el instrumento, (2) las frases que expresan el grado de satisfacción del docente con respecto a algunos aspectos de docencia, investigación y extensión, y (3) los datos personales y profesionales a completar.

Este instrumento es absolutamente confidencial y anónimo. La información que ud. suministre sólo será tratada en conjunto con el resto de la muestra. Por favor, no identifique el cuestionario.

Instrucciones

1. Lea cuidadosamente y responda cada aspecto señalado.
2. Indique el grado de satisfacción que usted siente por el aspecto particular de su posición como profesor universitario que se enuncia, haciendo uso de la siguiente escala:

   * ***Si siente que el aspecto que describe parte de sus funciones le da más satisfacción de la que esperaba, encierre en un círculo el número que indica "Muy Satisfecho" (5).***
   * ***Si siente que el aspecto que describe parte de sus funciones le da sólo la satisfacción que esperaba, encierre en un círculo el número que indica "Satisfecho" (4).***
   * ***Si no tiene ninguna opinión con respecto al aspecto indicado, encierre en un círculo el número que indica "Neutral" (3).***
   * ***Si siente que el aspecto que describe parte de sus funciones le da menos satisfacción de lo que esperaba, encierre en un círculo el número que indica "Insatisfecho" (2).***
   * ***Si siente que el aspecto que describe parte de sus funciones le dá mucho menos de la satisfacción que esperaba, encierre en un círculo el número que indica "Muy Insatisfecho" (1).***

3. Responda a cada frase.
4. Encierre en un círculo sólo una de las alternativas de respuesta planteada.

PARTE I
Aspectos de Docencia

Cuál es el grado de satisfacción que ud siente con los siguientes aspectos de la docencia ?

	MS	S	N	I	MI
1. la docencia como profesión	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
2. el trabajo en el aula	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
3. la libertad en la selección de objetivos, contenidos, materiales instruccionales del curso que enseña	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
4. la elaboración de exámenes	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
5. los procedimientos (trabajos escritos, exámenes) usados para evaluar a los estudiantes en la mayoría de los cursos del departamento	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
6. los métodos de enseñanza que usa en el (los) curso(s) que enseña	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
7. la asesoría académica que brinda a los estudiantes	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
8. las condiciones físicas, laboratorios, salones especializados y equipos disponibles para la enseñanza en su especialidad	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
9. el número de alumnos en sus cursos	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
10. la carga acádemica asignada	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
11. los reconocimientos institucionales para la docencia	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

PARTE II
Aspectos de Investigación

Cuál es el grado de satisfacción que ud. siente con los siguientes aspectos de la investigación?

	MS	S	N	I	MI
1. el apoyo económico de la institución para la investigación	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
2. el tiempo libre permitido por la institución para investigar	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
3. las oportunidades para publicar	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

	MS	S	N	I	MI
4. las posibilidades de conseguir permisos sabáticos para dedicarse a la investigación	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
5. la asistencia técnica ofrecida para el análisis de datos	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
6. la disponibilidad del centro de computación para el procesamiento de datos	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
7. el apoyo logístico para la investigación	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
8. el departamento como ente académico estimulante para la investigación	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
9. los reconocimientos institucionales para la investigación	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

PARTE III
Aspectos de Extensión

Cúal es el grado de satisfacción que ud. siente con los siguientes aspectos de extensión?

	MS	S	N	I	MI
1. las oportunidades ofrecidas fuera de la institución para adquirir nuevos conocimientos en la disciplina que enseña	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
2. los esfuerzos del departamento para apoyar el desarrollo profesional de los docentes	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
3. el trabajo en comisiones en la Universidad	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
4. los servicios profesionales prestados a entes externos	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
5. el trabajo realizado con los distritos escolares	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
6. las oportunidades de capacitación profesional ofrecidas por la institución	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
7. las reuniones convocadas por el departamento	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
8. el apoyo económico para participar en eventos, presentar trabajos, etc.	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
9. los reconocimientos institucionales por la actividad de extensión	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)

Datos Personales y Profesionales

Responda a las preguntas que a continuación se le formulan acerca de algunos aspectos de su vida personal y profesional. Encierre en un círculo o complete según sea el caso.

Nombre del Instituto_____

Dependencia al cual se adscribe _____

1. Sexo	Masculino	___	Femenino	___
2. Edad	menor de 30 años	___	31 - 40 años	___
	41 - 50 años	___	51 - 60 años	___
	Mayor de 60 años	___		
3. Categoría académica	Profesor Titular	___	Profesor Asociado	___
	Profesor Agregado	___	Profesor Asistente	___
	Profesor Instructor	___		
4. Título más alto obtenido	Doctorado	___	Maestría	___
	Especialista	___	Licenciatura/Profesor	___
	Otro, ningún título	___		

5. Cuantos años han pasado desde que obtuvo su último título? _____ años

6. Años de experiencia docente en educación superior

   a. En este departamento_____ años
   b. En este instituto _____ años
   c. En otro instituto de educ. superior _____ años
   d. Total _____ años

7. Ha tenido usted experiencia docente previa en

   a. educación primaria Sí_____ No_____
   b. educación secundaria Sí_____ No_____
   c. otro instituto de educ. superior Sí_____ No_____

8. Ha recibido algún premio o reconocimiento por sus labores en

   a. docencia? Sí ____ No _____
   b. investigación? Sí ____ No _____
   c. extensión? Sí ____ No _____